## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION 3:03-cv-551

CINDERELLA BLAKNEY,	)	
Plaintiff, v.	)	
	)	ORDER
CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG SCHOOLS,	)	
Defendant.	) ) )	

On July 13, 2006, this Court issued an Show Cause Order instructing Plaintiff Blakney to demonstrate why her case should not be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure prosecute the claim. (Doc. No. 40). Specifically, the plaintiff was asked to explain why she had failed to submit an Amended Complaint after: 1) having been instructed by the Court in April of 2005 to amend her Complaint (Doc. No. 26); and 2) she was put on notice by the magistrate judge on January 10, 2006, that she had improperly submitted an Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 37). Having reviewed Blakney's response (Doc. No. 41), the Court finds that her proffered reasons do not justify, or even explain, her failure comply with the Court's previous orders concerning her Amended Complaint. The Court specifically finds that its denial of her request to proceed *in forma pauperis* (after Blakney had already paid the filing fee) and her unfortunate financial situation are irrelevant to her delay, as there is minimal – if any – cost involved in simply requesting leave from the Court to file an Amended Complaint. See also Martone v.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Specifically, the plaintiff had failed both to seek leave to file her Amended Complaint and to sign the submitted document. (Doc. No. 37).

Connecticut General Life Ins. Co., 983 F.2d 1056, 1992 U.S. App. LEXIS 37150 (4th Cir. Md. 1992) (unpublished table decision) (claims of financial difficulties do not excuse a litigant's failure to comply a court's instructions).

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Blakney's case be DISMISSED.

Signed: January 29, 2007

Robert J. Conrad, Jr.

Chief United States District Judge